



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/539,194	04/20/2006	John Kerr	P17794-USI	2334
27045 7590 03/22/2007 ERICSSON INC. 6300 LEGACY DRIVE M/S EVR 1-C-11 PLANO, TX 75024			EXAMINER HO, HUY C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/22/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/539,194

Applicant(s)

KERR ET AL.

Examiner

Huy C. Ho

Art Unit

2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 January 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 12-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 June 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see, filed 01/17/2007, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 12-28 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of **Rasanen et al. (7,181,202)** and further in view of **Houde (6,032,043)**.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary.

Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

Art Unit: 2617

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. **Claims 12-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rasanen et al. (7,181,202) and further in view of Houde (6,032,043).**

Consider claim 12, Rasanen teaches a method for setting up a connection in a system for mobile telecommunications, wherein the following steps are performed by a first call control node:

receiving a call set-up request message comprising an indication of at least two services and an identification of a called party (see the abstract, col 3 lines 4-16 and lines 40-67, col 4 lines 1-3, 60-67, col 5 lines 1-67, col 6 lines 5-67);

sending a routing information request message to a database for storing subscriber data, wherein the request comprises an identification of a first of the at least two services, an identification of the called party, and an indication that at least one further routing request message will be sent (see the abstract, col 3 lines 4-16 and lines 40-67, col 4 lines 1-3, 60-67, col 5 lines 1-67, col 6 lines 5-67);

receiving a response message from the database (see the abstract, col 3 lines 4-16 and lines 40-67, col 4 lines 1-3, 60-67, col 5 lines 1-67, col 6 lines 5-67);

Rasanen does not specifically show determining that the response message comprises an indication that the database is adapted to process the indication that at least one further routing info request message will be sent, however, Rasanen describes some appropriate server entities being used in the communication network for implementing the procedure of handling at least two services (col 1 lines 52-65, col 2 lines 38-51). In an analogous art, Houde teaches determining that the response message comprises an indication that the database is adapted to process the indication that at least one further

routing info request message will be sent (see figures 1, 3, 5 6 and 7, the abstract, col 1 lines 30-50, col 3 lines 40-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify and incorporate Houde teachings into Rasanen invention to have the feature of determining that the response message comprises an indication that the database is adapted to process the indication that at least one further routing info request message will be sent.

Rasanen, modified by Houde, further teaches sending a further routing information request message comprising an identification of a further service, and receiving a further response message (see the abstract, col 3 lines 4-16 and lines 40-67, col 4 lines 1-3, 60-67, col 5 lines 1-67, col 6 lines 5-67); and

analyzing the received response messages (see the abstract, col 3 lines 4-16 and lines 40-67, col 4 lines 1-3, 60-67, col 5 lines 1-67, col 6 lines 5-67); and,

sending or not in dependence of the result of the analysis a call set-up request message to a further call control node (see the abstract, col 3 lines 4-16 and lines 40-67, col 4 lines 1-3, 60-67, col 5 lines 1-67, col 6 lines 5-67).

Consider claim 14, Rasanen teaches a method for setting up a connection in a system for mobile telecommunications, wherein the following steps are performed by a database for storing subscriber data:

receiving a routing information request message comprising an identification of a first service, an identification of a called party, and an indication that at least one further routing request message will be sent (see the abstract, col 3 lines 4-16 and lines 40-67, col 4 lines 1-3, 60-67, col 5 lines 1-67, col 6 lines 5-67);

checking subscriber data of the called party (see the abstract, col 3 lines 4-16 and lines 40-67, col 4 lines 1-3, 60-67, col 5 lines 1-67, col 6 lines 5-67);

determining that the requested service is permitted for a connection to the called party (col 3 lines 4-16 and lines 40-67, col 4 lines 1-3, 60-67, col 5 lines 1-67, col 6 lines 5-67);

fetching a number for further setting up of the connection towards the called party (col 3 lines 4-16 and lines 40-67, col 4 lines 1-3, 60-67, col 5 lines 1-67, col 6 lines 5-67);

preparing a response message related to the result of the check (col 3 lines 4-16 and lines 40-67, col 4 lines 1-3, 60-67, col 5 lines 1-67, col 6 lines 5-67); and,

sending the response message comprising the number for further setting up and an indication that the database is adapted to process the indication that at least one further routing info request message will be sent (col 3 lines 4-16 and lines 40-67, col 4 lines 1-3, 60-67, col 5 lines 1-67, col 6 lines 5-67).

Consider claim 23, Rasanen teaches a call control node comprising:

a message generation unit for generating a first routing information request message with an indication of a first service, an identification of a called party and an indicator that at least one further routing request message will be sent, and for generating at least one further routing request message comprising an indication of a second service (col 3 lines 4-16 and lines 40-67, col 4 lines 1-3, 60-67, col 5 lines 1-67, col 6 lines 5-67).

Consider claim 25, A database for storing subscriber data, comprising:

Rasanen does not specifically show a processing unit adapted to process an indication received in a routing information request message indicating that at least one further routing request message will be sent, wherein a mobile station roaming number is fetched and sent only in response to a first routing information request message for a connection and wherein an indication is returned in said response indicating that the database is adapted to handle the received indicator, however, it is noticeable that Rasanen discloses the major idea in a procedure of setting up a wireless communication for handling at

least two services of communication via a wireless network, also, the disclosure of switching centers MSC's, servers being used in the communication network infrastructure for carrying out the necessary tasks (col 4 lines 47-67, col 5 lines 10-67 and col 6 lines 4-32). In an analogous art, Houde teaches a processing unit adapted to process an indication received in a routing information request message indicating that at least one further routing request message will be sent, wherein a mobile station roaming number is fetched and sent only in response to a first routing information request message for a connection and wherein an indication is returned in said response indicating that the database is adapted to handle the received indicator (the abstract, col 3 lines 40-67, col 4 lines 12-59, col 6 lines 10-27, lines 50-67, col 8 lines 57-67, col 9 lines 1-15, col 10 lines 9-33). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify and incorporate Houde teachings into Rasanen invention to have the feature of a processing unit adapted to process an indication received in a routing information request message indicating that at least one further routing request message will be sent, wherein a mobile station roaming number is fetched and sent only in response to a first routing information request message for a connection and wherein an indication is returned in said response indicating that the database is adapted to handle the received indicator.

Consider claim 13, The method recited in claim 12, Rasanen, modified by Houde, teaches wherein the step of sending a further routing information request is repeated until a routing information request message is sent for each service indicated in the call set-up message (col 2 lines 5-40, col 4 lines 13-30, 54-67, col 5 lines 1-10).

Consider claim 15. The method recited in claim 14, Rasanen, modified by Houde, teaches wherein in response to receiving the further routing information request message, the steps of checking, preparing and sending are performed, and wherein a response message is sent that does not comprise a mobile station roaming number.

Art Unit: 2617

Consider claims 16, 22 and 24, The method recited in claims 12, 17 and 23, Rasanen, modified by Houde, further teaches wherein the first call control node is a gateway mobile services switching centre (figure 1, col 2 lines 1-13, lines 52-62).

Consider claims 17, 26 and 28, The method recited in claims 12, 19 and 25, Rasanen, modified by Houde, teaches wherein the database is a home location register or a home subscriber server (figure 1, col 3 lines 40-67).

Consider claim 18. The method recited in claim 12, Rasanen, modified by Houde, teaches wherein the number is a mobile station roaming number or a forwarded to number (col 2 lines 25-40, col 7 lines 25-65, col 8 lines 55-67).

Consider claim 19, the method recited in claim 12, Rasanen, modified by Houde, teaches wherein the routing request message is a send routing information message (col 7 lines 25-67 and col 8 lines 1-35).

Consider claim 20. The method recited in claim 12, Rasanen, modified by Houde, teaches wherein the response message is a send routing information result message (col 6 lines 50-67, col 8 lines 5-35 and col 9 lines 15-60).

Consider claim 21. The method recited in claim 12, Rasanen, modified by Houde, further teaches wherein the call set-up request message is an initial address message (col 6 lines 10-32).

Consider claim 27. The database recited claim 25, Rasanen, modified by Houde, teaches wherein the database is an authentication, authorization and accounting server (col 4 lines 12-50, col 6 lines 50-67).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Huy C. Ho whose telephone number is (571) 270-1108. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m., EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nick Corsaro can be reached on (571) 272-7876. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


NICK CORSARO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600